

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 94 12:01:56 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #629
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sun, 5 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 629

Today's Topics:

440 in So. Cal. (7 msgs)
Getting started in HAMS
Ham Radio few problem (2 msgs)
wanted 7mhz tcvr like HW22 or Swan MB-40.
YAESU FT840

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 12:32:17 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> The current issue of "closed" versus "open" is not a coordination issue.
> It's a spectrum management policy issue.

And, since to the FCC all repeaters are "closed", and all trustees
regardless of their machine's "open" or "closed" status have the ultimate
say of who can and who can not access the repeater, then the entire
spectrum management policy issue is moot. Frequency coordinators ought
to be doing what they were intended - to coordinate machines in such a
way as to minimize interference with other systems - without consideration
for their "open" or "closed" status.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 12:50:49 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

greg@netcom.com (Greg Bullough) writes:

> What isn't yours can't be taken away from you. The airwaves are a public
> resource. The fact that you were in the park first doesn't mean that
> you have the right to pitch your tent and make it your home.

Sigh. This is getting tiring. Once again (you might want to print this out so you can reference it again in case you forget):

1. Nobody has claimed that "closed" (or "open", for that matter) repeaters 'own' their frequency.
2. Nobody has indicated that amateurs cannot operate on repeater input or output frequencies, even if the repeater is considered "closed".
3. I, and others, have indicated that if someone opts for #2, however, they have to insure that they do not interfere with the repeater on those frequencies.
4. "Coordination" is a status which can be granted, taken away, or lost. When people use the term "taken away" or "lose", they are usually referring to coordinated status, not to some claim that they "own" a frequency.

> Oh yes, I'm a dyed-in-the-wool Red. As must be anyone who advocates
> the outrageous notion that public resources made so by Act of Congress
> (radio spectrum) ought to be made available to the public, and be utilized
> at the pleasure of the public.

The logical extension of your argument is that you should have no operating limits placed on you at all. If you want to set up an amateur repeater on 880.50, you should be able to.

> ...and you can salvage the site, the single most valuable commodity.

This is a value judgement. Around here, sites are a dime a dozen.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 12:56:16 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> Actually, what really happened was that the repeater you reference, CLARA,
> first ***re-coordinated*** itself as CLOSED before commencement of the
> lawsuits, in recognition of the weak grounds for barring specific hams
> from an open repeater.

I guess now FCC statements == weak ground.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 12:57:00 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> Actually, what really happened was that the repeater you reference, CLARA,

> first ***re-coordinated*** itself as CLOSED before commencement of the
> lawsuits, in recognition of the weak grounds for barring specific hams
> from an open repeater.

I guess now FCC statements and rules/regulations == weak ground.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 13:02:33 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

greg@netcom.com (Greg Bullough) writes:

> Imagine how far behind where it is now the packet network would be if
> the generous souls who run PBBS systems had the same attitude?

I know several packet operators who give "perks" to people who donate equipment and money to the system. I eventually expect that some packet systems will become "closed", especially those with alot of functions and links.

> I submit that most hams, who can afford to, will support a repeater
> group where they use the machine frequently. Some can't afford to. No
> matter. Hell, we've been known to give youngsters use of our old HF
> rig for an indefinite period, just to keep them on the air.

Some people can't afford food. Let's socialize food manufacturing and distribution. Some people can't afford housing. Free housing for all. Some people can't afford health care. Let's socialize... Ooops, I forgot, they're already doing that one.

> Our we can all band together in our little cliques and country-clubs,
> and re-hash the same thing on our way to work each day, with no fear
> of meeting someone who we don't know already.

I believe this to be an overgeneralization. There are many closed systems which are willing to accept new members. Many closed systems

also allow visitors. Yes, some are cliquey and country-club snobby too. So what?

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 16:28:34 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

: > Actually, what really happened was that the repeater you reference, CLARA,
: > first ***re-coordinated*** itself as CLOSED before commencement of the
: > lawsuits, in recognition of the weak grounds for barring specific hams
: > from an open repeater.

: I guess now FCC statements == weak ground.

Sorry if the facts are confusing you, Mike, but my above recounting of the facts stands. Clara was advised by its very expensive legal counsel that they would be on much stronger grounds trying to bar certain individuals from the repeater if the repeater were coordinated as closed.

They consequently applied to the coordinating body to re-coordinate their pair as closed. The application, in recognition of the above, was granted.

Sorry if the above facts conflict with your view of things.

--

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA
AB6WR

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 15:48:25 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun2.130604.13680@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>

>In the past two years that I've been a repeater trustee, my machine has
>cost me in excess of \$6,000; that doesn't include all the sweat equity
>I've put into it where I've not put in some OT at work or turned down
>a consulting job because I had to work on the repeater for some reason.

That's amazing. The most popular, and widest coverage, 440 MHz machine in Atlanta cost less than \$500 total, and has had less than 16 manhours total spent on maintaining it in the last 4 years. Like with many other *open* machines, the site and power are donated by a public spirited corporation, in this case a cabinet 970 feet up the WXIA-TV broadcast tower. The machine itself uses conservatively run GE commercial grade radios, bought surplus, and a simple microcontroller by S-Com. Good equipment, properly installed, just doesn't need much maintainence.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 5 Jun 1994 18:44:52 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!po.cwru.edu!
sct@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Getting started in HAMS

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <elroy.770786465@rintintin.Colorado.EDU>,

ELROY LAWRENCE A <elroy@rintintin.Colorado.EDU> wrote:

> Can anyone tell me where to get the FAQ on getting started in amateur radio?

The best and most readily available FAQs are the books sold in every Radio Shack: the ARRL's Now You're Talking and Gordon West's Technician-class license manual. They will get you off on the right foot.

If you'd like to save some money, take a look in your local library. The books they have will give you all the general principles of ham radio, but the rules and exams have changed a lot in the last few years so you will want to buy an up-to-date license manual anyway.

Followups to rec.radio.amateur.misc, please.

Stephen

--

Stephen Trier
sct@po.cwru.edu
KG8IF

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 13:33:34 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

> OK lets take this to the next step. Most technically proficient amateurs
> today can decode touch-tone signals that are broadcast on the input
> frequency. Most of you will now agree that touch-tone is no longer an
> access-restriction for controlling or functioning an amateur repeater.
> Surely by punching in the correct sequence on a touch-tone pad found on
> any radio you are now controlling the repeater. You might even be able to
> use the repeater for third party traffic. Where do you draw the line?
> If PL is not an access restriction in the historic and common sense then
> touch-tone is not sacred.

If PL is not an access restriction then *NO* form of access restriction
is sacred, since any amateur can figure out how to bring up a machine. Once
someone figures out how to bring up a closed machine, does that give them
the right to operate the station? Even the most convoluted mechanisms
won't work - someone can always figure it out.

(Of course, I'd like to create a RF fingerprint access system, but the
technology is too slow and expensive right now.)

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 13:29:36 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ham Radio few problem

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jws@fc.hp.com (John Schmidt) writes:

> A closed carrier operated system sounds like an oxymoron to me, unless you
> have someone playing channel cop 24 hours a day. If you have several
> members who don't have a real life, maybe you can do that.

Since a repeater trustee is responsible for all traffic rebroadcast through his/her machine, he certainly should have control operators capable of monitoring the system all day.

> I said in a previous
> post I wouldn't hang around if asked to leave, but neither you nor Mike have
> been able to give a single example of the FCC disciplining a ham for
> attempting to use an ostensibly closed repeater while otherwise following
> all regulations -- that is, using proper calling procedures and not
> causing deliberate interference to other users.

You're right, I don't know of a specific case which has made it to the FCC for clarification, as most interference issues are handled through the OO and Auxiliary. I can say that I work closely with several members in the OO/Auxiliary program on other issues, and each of them agree that the scenario you describe would be considered interference.

Again, it boils down to intent. If the intent of the person is to make a call on a closed repeater, one would have to ask "why?", especially if nobody is going to come back to him.

Since the FCC has stated that repeater owners can limit who uses the station, the only option available to a control operator when an unauthorized user comes on the machine who refuses to leave is to shut the machine down. If the user keeps coming on the repeater, its pretty clear his/her intent is to keep the machine off the air by continually forcing the control operator to shut the machine down. Is this not interference with repeater operation?

Let's look at a similiar example. You have an open repeater with a members-only autopatch. Someone comes on the machine, IDs, and proceeds to attempt to crack the autopatch code. Is this interference? Again, intent.

Most of these cases around here have never made it past the OO/Auxiliary stage. Usually by then the offending party finds other things to do or mysteriously loses interest in ham radio.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 94 11:23:32 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.kei.com!ub!galileo.cc.rochester.edu!uhura.cc.rochester.edu!
natt@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: wanted 7mhz tcvr like HW22 or Swan MB-40.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 94 09:12:00 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!asuvax!pinyon.libre.com!twb!
chris.hinkle@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: YAESU FT840
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am thinking of getting a Yaesu FT840 HF rig and was wondering

Well, having onlt the 757 to compare it with, I like it alot. the extra
memories, of which you have two per mem channel, are both tunable. It also has
the ctscss tones built in(too bad no FM unit built in, you need to buy this

separately). As far as the reciever goes it is quite a bit nicer than the 757's
, very quite for the price your paying, the shift feature is also very effective
for QRM. I use this rig mobile 90% of the time and enjoy it. Now my opinions are
very biased, dur to the fact that, I have never owned any other make of radio,
and I got the rig for 675.00 brand new. If you can wait for Yaesu days again,
the sale price was 729.00. Well i'm certain you'll be happy with whatever your
purchase is, because with a good antenna, you'll work the world eventually. 73
N7UJU

≥ MR/2 2.0 NR ≥ Never assume. It makes an "ass" out of "u" and "me".

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 16:36:19 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!rogjd@decwrl.dec.com

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun4.081913.2429@hnrc.tufts.edu>, <2sq5np\$2j@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<1994Jun5.090702.2432@hnrc.tufts.edu>
Subject : Re: FCC computers up!

Jerry Dallal (jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu) wrote:

: In article <2sq5np\$2j@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard)
writes:

: > In article <1994Jun4.081913.2429@hnrc.tufts.edu>,

: > Jerry Dallal <jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu> wrote:

: >>That's 6 per state per day. Makes you wonder what it was like before

: >>computers.

: >

: > Well, remember that the FCC most likely has one person doing applications;

: > there are 480-man-minutes per day, which means they're spending 1 minute, 36

: > seconds on each application if they're heads-down for the full day with no

: > breaks. I'd say they're doing pretty well...but I also understand that's cold

: > comfort for folks waiting on license processing.

: I've no complaint with what they were doing, given their available staffing.

: (In fact, I realized some might interpret my comment as criticism and

: cancelled the post. You must have caught it in the short period it was

: active.) In NH, KC10X publishes the KY1N Memorial list of scheduled VE exams.

: June, which is typical, shows 41 sessions for the 6 state NE area. If you

: figure 10 licenses or upgrades per session and assume its roughly uniform

: throughout the country, you get a figure that fits comfortably within their

: new capability, but it's easy to see why the waiting time has been steadily

: increasing.

Actually, assuming that the FCC's new computer system enables it to handle
the applications load with reasonable facility, we should compliment them
on their cost-management. It is proverbial in the management
cost-containment world that it is far more cost-effective to deal with
this sort of process by improving systems (as they have done) rather than
by adding (much more expensive) headcount.

Personally, I don't want instant licensing, and I don't want fees for
licensing, so what they have done seems pretty OK to me.

The real question I am curious about is rather the current torrid rate of
licensing will continue, or whether it will eventually level off. One
might suspect that there was a fair amount of pent-up demand for licensing
which the no-code ticket has solved. Or will the current rate continue or
accelerate?

Beats me!

73

--

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA
AB6WR

Date: 5 Jun 94 09:07:02 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!noc.near.net!
news.tufts.edu!news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2skv9f\$a2l@bigfoot.wustl.edu>, <1994Jun4.081913.2429@hnrc.tufts.edu>,
<2sq5np\$p2j@nyx10.cs.du.edu>tufts
Subject : Re: FCC computers up!

In article <2sq5np\$p2j@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard)
writes:

> In article <1994Jun4.081913.2429@hnrc.tufts.edu>,
> Jerry Dallal <jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu> wrote:
>>That's 6 per state per day. Makes you wonder what it was like before
>>computers.
>
> Well, remember that the FCC most likely has one person doing applications;
> there are 480-man-minutes per day, which means they're spending 1 minute, 36
> seconds on each application if they're heads-down for the full day with no
> breaks. I'd say they're doing pretty well...but I also understand that's cold
> comfort for folks waiting on license processing.

I've no complaint with what they were doing, given their available staffing.
(In fact, I realized some might interpret my comment as criticism and
cancelled the post. You must have caught it in the short period it was
active.) In NH, KC10X publishes the KY1N Memorial list of scheduled VE exams.
June, which is typical, shows 41 sessions for the 6 state NE area. If you
figure 10 licenses or upgrades per session and assume its roughly uniform
throughout the country, you get a figure that fits comfortably within their
new capability, but it's easy to see why the waiting time has been steadily
increasing.

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 01:32:18 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sn1dc\$5hf@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <gregCqts8v.45J@netcom.com>,
<2so39e\$t29@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2so39e\$t29@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> jreese@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Jim Reese) writes:

>In article <gregCqts8v.45J@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote:
>

>>Rather interesting that the
>>phrase 'closed repeater' and 'accomodate everyone' can be used together,
>>I think. But typical of the convoluted logic which those who are reaching
>>to justify their monopolization of a frequency on a a crowded band.

>

>Let's not twist my meaning here...

>

>By "accomodate everyone", I meant that the coordinating body must accomodate
>equally both trustees of open repeaters and trustees of closed ones. Its job
>is to minimize interference, not make judgement calls as to who is "more
>worthy" of a frequency.

This is where the classic frequency coordinator hat and the spectrum management hat get tangled. Many coordinating bodies try to wear both hats and there is a basic conflict. As coordinators, their constituency is repeater station operators and potential repeater station operators, but as spectrum managers, their constituency is the entire amateur community.

Many people feel that the only correct policy as coordinator is "first come, first serve", so whoever first files a non-conflicting application to operate a repeater gets the coordination in perpetuity. However, as spectrum managers, the body has to take into account the interests of all of the amateur community, users as well as operators of the designated repeater spectrum, in order to maximize the utility of the limited public resource to *all* amateurs. This is a dynamic role in a growing service. It's in this latter role of establishing public policy that most coordinating bodies fail to carry out their responsibilities.

Since coordination bodies are generally elected by their members, almost exclusively repeater owners, they tend to protect the status quo. That's only natural. However, when they also attempt to wear a spectrum manager hat and set public policy, they aren't representative of the amateur community at large. This is a fatal flaw and a basic conflict of interest.

The current issue of "closed" versus "open" is not a coordination issue. It's a spectrum management policy issue. Currently constituted coordination bodies aren't suited to dealing with this issue. It must be dealt with by a body representative of all amateur interests. In most cases, such a body

doesn't currently exist. Current coordinating bodies would do the amateur community a service by taking off their spectrum management hats and admitting they aren't the proper representatives to address the issues involved. What we have now is a committee of foxes setup to set fencing standards for the chicken coop.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #629
